



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

forth the policy of the two governments in regard to the Pacific and the Far East. It is as follows:

ARTICLES OF THE COVENANT.

"1. It is the wish of the two governments to encourage the free and peaceful development of their commerce on the Pacific ocean.

"2. The policy of both governments, uninfluenced by any aggressive tendencies, is directed to the maintenance of the existing *status quo* in the region above mentioned, and to the defense of the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry in China.

"3. They are accordingly firmly resolved reciprocally to respect the territorial possessions belonging to each other in said region.

"4. They are also determined to preserve the common interests of all powers in China by supporting by all pacific means at their disposal the independence and integrity of China and the principle of equal opportunity for commerce and industry of all nations in that empire.

"5. Should any event occur threatening the *status quo* as above described, or the principle of equal opportunity as above defined, it remains for the two governments to communicate with each other in order to arrive at an understanding as to what measures they may consider it useful to take."

The final letters exchanged between Ambassador Takahira and Secretary Root were as follows:

AMBASSADOR TAKAHIRA'S NOTE.

"Sir: The exchange of views between us, which has taken place at the several interviews which I have recently had the honor of holding with you, has shown that Japan and the United States, holding important outlying insular possessions in the region of the Pacific ocean, the governments of the two countries are animated by a common aim, policy and intention in that region.

"Believing that a frank avowal of that aim, policy and intention would not only tend to strengthen the relations of friendship and good neighborhood which have immemorably existed between Japan and the United States, but would materially contribute to the preservation of the general peace, the imperial government have authorized me to present to you an outline of their understanding of that common aim, policy and intention.

[Here follow the five articles of the declaration given above.]

If the foregoing outline accords with the view of the government of the United States I shall be gratified to receive your confirmation.

"I take this opportunity to renew to your excellency the assurance of my highest consideration.

"(Signed) K. TAKAHIRA.

"Hon. Elihu Root, Secretary of State."

SECRETARY ROOT'S REPLY.

"Department of State,

"Washington, November 30, 1908.

"*Excellency*: I have the honor of acknowledging the receipt of your note of to-day setting forth the result of views between us in our recent interview defining the understanding of the two governments in regard to their policy in the region of the Pacific Ocean.

"It is a pleasure to inform you that this expression of mutual understanding is welcome to the government of

the United States as appropriate to the happy relations of the two countries and as occasion for a concise mutual affirmation of that accordant policy respecting the Far East which the two governments have so frequently declared in the past.

"I am happy to be able to confirm to your excellency, on behalf of the United States, the declaration of the two governments embodied in the following words: [Here follow the five articles of the covenant.]

"Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurance of my highest consideration.

(Signed)

"ELIHU ROOT.

"His Excellency, Baron Kogoro Takahira, Japanese Ambassador."

The substance of this declaration was submitted in advance to the European governments interested in Chinese affairs, and responses expressing cordial sympathy and support were received from all of them.

## Progress Nevertheless.

### Franco-German Arbitration.

BARON D'ESTOURNELLES DE CONSTANT IN THE PARIS  
"MATIN" OF NOVEMBER 23

We must look at Germany as she is. Certain of her steps of progress are slow, in comparison with other countries, but rapid when she is compared with what she was ten years ago. Let me be more precise, and recall what I myself have seen.

The German government, at the first Peace Conference, was unwilling to have the subject of obligatory arbitration even discussed, and it was not without difficulty that one of her representatives, a man of noble spirit, Professor Zorn, obtained at Berlin authorization to take part in the reduction of the Convention of the 29th of July, 1899.

Five years later a second stage was reached. The King of England and Emperor William entered into an agreement at Kiel for the signing, between the two countries, of the first German Arbitration Convention, that of the 12th of July, 1904.

In 1907 came the third stage. The second Hague Conference met. Germany consented to discuss the question of obligatory arbitration. During weeks Baron Marshall gave himself to a veritable tournament. His resistance, it is true, was invincible. He triumphed, but by how many votes? "I can count them on the fingers of one hand," exclaimed the first delegate of the United States in a vehement plea. Five opposed, and four abstaining from voting, against all the rest of the civilized powers! Two hundred million, against one billion two hundred million inhabitants! And, furthermore, among the hostile votes there are some, that of Turkey, for example, which would to-day be on the other side.

The Yellow Book which our Minister of Foreign Affairs distributed to the Chambers last summer resumes these debates of four months at The Hague, but nobody in France reads them. They are read only abroad. There are found among them pictures, maps of the most striking interest, explanations of what has been done and of what remains to be done. [Here is inserted in M. d'Estournelles' article a circular map showing in a striking

way the relation of the five powers which voted against obligatory arbitration and the four which did not vote, to the rest of the world — in sum, two hundred and twenty-three millions to twelve hundred and eighty-five millions. That is, obligatory arbitration in the form of a general treaty was approved by the representatives of nearly six-sevenths of the population of the globe.]

After these struggles at The Hague the pessimists took their fill of despair. And yet this very year — fourth stage — the German government proposes the settlement of the Casablanca difference by arbitration. Is this a result to be ignored? Would it not have been found more natural, ten years ago, to hurl the two peoples against each other?

Already, four years ago, the Hague Convention had made it possible for Russia and Great Britain to entrust to judges the solution of the grave Hull incident. It was of course quite natural at that time for Russia, in the full tide of war with Japan, to wish to avoid a new conflict and to take advantage of the jurisdiction which she had been first in helping to create. England, too, a champion of arbitration, felt herself obliged to be faithful to herself. Germany, on the contrary, now recognizes for the first time the efficaciousness of a juridic solution which is not according to her traditions. And she recognizes it, in accord with whom? With France. In what conditions? At a time when she is not bound with us by any treaty of arbitration, and, even if she were so bound, she might have extricated herself by invoking the classic reservations of *national honor* and *vital interests*; for certainly it is the point of honor which is at stake, since the two governments divest themselves of the exercise of their sovereignty and put it into the hands of arbitrators, and empower them to fix the blame on the one who is in the wrong, and even to designate the one who shall express regrets.

These successive steps of progress are explained by the force of events. It is certain that France, pacific as she is, is not and never has been a nation which abandons herself; that she is ready to defend heroically not only her soil, but her liberty — even liberty itself. But Germany, whatever may be said about it, has reckoned with something besides our resistance, even with her own conscience and her own interest. It was to the interest of both governments to weigh their responsibilities and their risks before allowing an incident of secondary importance to end in bloodshed. A war lightly undertaken to-day would raise against the aggressive government a general revolt, not to say a revolution, while it would exalt the people invaded. Everywhere, in America as in Europe and even in the extreme Orient, war is held to be an operation something more than rough: it is considered ruinous in any event. The German government, like others, must follow the movement of public opinion. If it does not, it will, and it alone, isolate itself through its own fault and not through ours. We, on the contrary, we French, insisted with all our might, and, I may say, with all our heart, at The Hague that Germany should range herself with the majority, that unfavorable comparisons might not be made between the reassuring policy advocated by the French republic and that of the German empire. I wish, in conclusion, to render justice to the very great progress made in Germany within ten years, and it is my conviction that this progress is only

the prelude to further progress, even to the very last stage, when, by mutual concessions, the two peoples will finally be reconciled to each other for their common good, for their glory and for the welfare of the whole world.

## America's Part in International Progress.

BY EDWIN D. MEAD.

[In connection with the recent International Peace Congress in London, a banquet was given to the delegates by the Government, about five hundred guests being present. The principal address was by Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister. This was responded to by Lord Courtney, president of the Congress, by Prof. Theodore Ruyssen representing France, by Professor Quidde for Germany, and by Edwin D. Mead for the United States. Mr. Mead's address is here given.]

The Bishop of Hereford, whom we highly honor in America, and who came over to the International Peace Congress in Boston in 1904, has been saying very pleasant things about us here in England since, for which we are grateful. He has said among other things that the United States is itself the greatest peace society in the world, because it illustrates over a greater area and with greater power than is done anywhere else in the world the three great principles of free trade, an interstate court, and federation, which are precisely the principles which we need to extend to international affairs to get just the kind of world we want. It is worth noting here, when our Peace Congress is to be immediately followed in London by a Free Trade Congress, that the great peace men have all been free traders; the two things hang together. And the Bishop is right in pointing to the United States, unhappily the worst of protective nations in its dealings with the outside world, as primarily a supreme illustration of the benefits of free trade; for over its whole three thousand miles, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, including in the federation many states larger than various European countries, it has complete free trade, — and that and not its protection is the real principle of its prosperity. The Bishop's other two points are so obvious that I do not need to speak about them.

These three great principles of our federal constitution have been so beneficent in their national operation that we are certainly happy in commending them, and in having them commended, as the cardinal principles of international union. And not only do we like to view our own national federation as a prophecy and preparation for the federation of the world, but the first principles of the founders of the American republic were the principles of peace and international justice. It is right to say, I think, that there was no other group of men in the world at that time who stood so emphatically for the things for which we stand in this London Congress to-day as the illustrious group led by Washington and Jefferson and Franklin. Franklin went so far as to say that there never was a good war nor a bad peace; and from his writings and those of his associates we may gather anticipations of almost every argument which we use to-day.

It was not an American nor an Englishman, but the great German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, who said truly, in his tractate on "Eternal Peace," that universal